

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/739,305	12/19/2000	Yves Le Gendre	Q62357	3328	
7590 04/28/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			GARY, ERIKA A		
Suite 800 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	OC 20037-3213		2681	Q	
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
· Advisory Action	09/739,305	LE GENDRE ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Erika A. Gary	2681			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE 1 Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this app (1) a timely filed amendment w	lication. A proper reply to a hich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exte 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorten (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three re earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date is FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF Todate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 tension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set is	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee the fee. The appropriate extension fee under in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	aterially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number o	f finally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejoined.4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou		concrete timely filed amendment			
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	s:				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square ap	oproved or b) disapproved b	y the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	··			
10. Other:					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Grube does not teach sending from the target mobile radio a request for information regarding the identity of the source mobile radio. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and finds this limitation in Grube's disclosure in column 2, lines 5-15 which states that "the target communication unit transmits, during transmission of the voice message, a caller data request regarding the source communication unit". Applicant also argues that Grube is directed to a mobile radio system while DeFazio is directed to a telephone network. The Examiner contends that it is well known in the art to implement features of a wireless network into a telephone network and vice versa. It has been held that rearranging of parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. The Examiner maintains that the combination of references is proper and renders Applicant's invention obvious.

ERIKA GARY

PATENT EXAMINER